

## **REMARKS**

### **I. General**

Claims 1-3, 5-8, 11-17, 19-27, and 30-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okazawa et al. (U.S. Patent No.: 6,378,021, hereinafter Okazawa) in view of Prager et al. (U.S. Patent No.: 5,838,918, hereinafter Prager).

Claim 4 stands objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but is otherwise allowable.

### **II. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections**

Claims 1-3, 5-8, 11-14, 26, and 30 stand rejected over Okazawa in view of Prager. Applicant hereby traverses the rejection.

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the reference itself or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the applied reference. *See In re Vaeck* 947 F.2d 488, 20 U.S.P.Q.2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. *In re Merck and Co., Inc.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 U.S.P.Q. 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Finally, the applied reference must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (C.C.P.A. 1974). Without conceding any other criteria, Applicant asserts that the Examiner's rejection of these claims does not satisfy the third criterion.

#### **A. Independent Claim 1**

Claim 1 requires "a service processor that is connected to each of the cell boards." Okazawa in view of Prager does not teach or suggest these limitations. The Office Action refers to Okazawa column 5, lines 8-40 as teaching these limitations, stating Okazawa teaches a "switch processor connected to each of the processor boards." Office Action at 2. Applicant respectfully notes that the only processors that Okazawa teaches are on processor boards or

processor memory boards (e.g., PB 11 or PMB 21). *See* Okazawa Figures 1 and 2. Further, Applicant respectfully notes that the only component connected to each of the processor boards (PB 11 or PMB 21) is a switch (i.e., SW 14). *See Id.* Applicant is unable to find any aspect of Okazawa teaching or suggesting that SW 14 is comprised of or performs the functionality of a processor, but rather that SW 14 is merely used to provide connections between processor boards 11, interface boards 13, and memory boards 14 (Figure 1) or between processor memory boards 21 (Figure 2). *See also* Okazawa col. 4, ll. 50-59. Prager is not relied upon and does not teach or suggest these limitations. As such, Okazawa in view of Prager does not teach or suggest “a service processor that is connected to each of the cell boards.” Thus, the references when combined do not teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Therefore, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 1 is patentable over Okazawa in view of Prager and requests the rejection’s withdrawal.

Claim 1 also requires “the service processor and each cell board stores a copy of the data.” The art of record does not teach or suggest these limitations. The Office Action admits Okazawa does not teach these limitations and reads teachings of Prager as meeting these limitations. *See* Office Action at 2-3. Okazawa teaches a computer system comprised of multiple processor boards (PB 11 and/or PMB 21) and a crossbar switch (SW 14). *See* Okazawa Figures 1 and 2. Prager teaches configuration management of large complex, distributed networks of heterogeneous systems (col. 1, ll. 45-48), wherein each system maintains a configuration database (*see* col. 2, ll. 26-33). As such the teachings of Okazawa in view of Prager may suggest Prager’s configuration management of distributed networks of multiple ones of Okazawa’s computer systems, therein requiring each of Okazawa’s overall systems to maintain a configuration database. However, Applicant is unable to find any aspect of Okazawa or Prager teaching or suggesting the maintaining multiple configuration databases within each network element (e.g., on each of Okazawa’s PBs 11 or PMBs 21 and SW 14). Hence, Okazawa in view of Prager does not teach or suggest “the service processor and each cell board stores a copy of the data.” Thus, the references when combined do not teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Therefore, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 1 is patentable over Okazawa in view of Prager and requests the rejection’s withdrawal.

## **B. Independent Claim 15**

Claim 15 requires “providing a service processor that is connected to each of the cell boards.” Okazawa in view of Prager does not teach or suggest these limitations. The Office Action refers to Okazawa column 5, lines 8-40 as teaching these limitations, stating Okazawa teaches a “switch processor connected to each of the processor boards.” Office Action at 2. Applicant respectfully notes that the only processors that Okazawa teaches are on processor boards or processor memory boards (e.g., PB 11 or PMB 21). *See* Okazawa Figures 1 and 2. Further, Applicant respectfully notes that the only component connected to each of the processor boards (PB 11 or PMB 21) is a switch (i.e., SW 14). *See Id.* Applicant is unable to find any aspect of Okazawa teaching or suggesting that SW 14 is comprised of or performs the functionality of a processor, but rather that SW 14 is merely used to provide connections between processor boards 11, interface boards 13, and memory boards 14 (Figure 1) or between processor memory boards 21 (Figure 2). *See also* Okazawa col. 4, ll. 50-59. Prager is not relied upon and does not teach or suggest these limitations. As such, Okazawa in view of Prager does not teach or suggest “providing a service processor that is connected to each of the cell boards.” Thus, the references when combined do not teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Therefore, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 15 is patentable over Okazawa in view of Prager and requests the rejection’s withdrawal.

Claim 15 also requires “storing a copy of the data in the service processor and in each cell board.” The art of record does not teach or suggest these limitations. The Office Action admits Okazawa does not teach these limitations and reads teachings of Prager as meeting these limitations. *See* Office Action at 2-3. Okazawa teaches a computer system comprised of multiple processor boards (PB 11 and/or PMB 21) and a crossbar switch (SW 14). *See* Okazawa Figures 1 and 2. Prager teaches configuration management of large complex, distributed networks of heterogeneous systems (col. 1, ll. 45-48), wherein each system maintains a configuration database (*see* col. 2, ll. 26-33). As such the teachings of Okazawa in view of Prager may suggest Prager’s configuration management of distributed networks of multiple ones of Okazawa’s computer systems, therein requiring each of Okazawa’s overall systems to maintain a configuration database. However, Applicant is unable to find any aspect of Okazawa

or Prager teaching or suggesting the maintaining multiple configuration databases within each network element (e.g., on each of Okazawa's PBs 11 or PMBs 21 and SW 14). Hence, Okazawa in view of Prager does not teach or suggest "storing a copy of the data in the service processor and in each cell board." Thus, the references when combined do not teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Therefore, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 15 is patentable over Okazawa in view of Prager and requests the rejection's withdrawal.

### **C. Independent Claim 27**

Claim 27 requires "a service processor that is connected to each of the cell boards via at least one bus." Okazawa in view of Prager does not teach or suggest these limitations. The Office Action refers to Okazawa column 5, lines 8-40 as teaching these limitations, stating Okazawa teaches a "switch processor connected to each of the processor boards." Office Action at 2. Applicant respectfully notes that the only processors that Okazawa teaches are on processor boards or processor memory boards (e.g., PB 11 or PMB 21). *See* Okazawa Figures 1 and 2. Further, Applicant respectfully notes that the only component connected to each of the processor boards (PB 11 or PMB 21) is a switch (i.e., SW 14). *See Id.* Applicant is unable to find any aspect of Okazawa teaching or suggesting that SW 14 is comprised of or performs the functionality of a processor, but rather that SW 14 is merely used to provide connections between processor boards 11, interface boards 13, and memory boards 14 (Figure 1) or between processor memory boards 21 (Figure 2). *See also* Okazawa col. 4, ll. 50-59. Prager is not relied upon and does not teach or suggest these limitations. As such, Okazawa in view of Prager does not teach or suggest "a service processor that is connected to each of the cell boards via at least one bus." Thus, the references when combined do not teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Therefore, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 27 is patentable over Okazawa in view of Prager and requests the rejection's withdrawal.

Claim 27 also requires "the service processor and each cell board stores a copy of data that describes a configuration for the computer system." The art of record does not teach or suggest these limitations. The Office Action admits Okazawa does not teach these limitations

and reads teachings of Prager as meeting these limitations. *See* Office Action at 2-3. Okazawa teaches a computer system comprised of multiple processor boards (PB 11 and/or PMB 21) and a crossbar switch (SW 14). *See* Okazawa Figures 1 and 2. Prager teaches configuration management of large complex, distributed networks of heterogeneous systems (col. 1, ll. 45-48), wherein each system maintains a configuration database (*see* col. 2, ll. 26-33). As such the teachings of Okazawa in view of Prager may suggest Prager's configuration management of distributed networks of multiple ones of Okazawa's computer systems, therein requiring each of Okazawa's overall systems to maintain a configuration database. However, Applicant is unable to find any aspect of Okazawa or Prager teaching or suggesting the maintaining multiple configuration databases within each network element (e.g., on each of Okazawa's PBs 11 or PMBs 21 and SW 14). Hence, Okazawa in view of Prager does not teach or suggest "the service processor and each cell board stores a copy of data that describes a configuration for the computer system." Thus, the references when combined do not teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Therefore, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 27 is patentable over Okazawa in view of Prager and requests the rejection's withdrawal.

**D. Dependent Claims 2-3, 5-8, 11-14, 16-17, 19-26, and 30-32**

Claims 2-3, 5-8, 11-14, 16-17, 19-26, and 30-32 each depend from and inherit all the limitations of one of claims 1, 15, or 27. As discussed above, claims 1, 15, and 27 contain features and limitations that are not taught in Okazawa and Prager. Thus, claims 2-3, 5-8, 11-14, 16-17, 19-26, and 30-32 contain features and limitations that are not taught in Okazawa and Prager. Therefore, Appellant respectfully asserts that claims 2-3, 5-8, 11-14, 16-17, 19-26, and 30-32 are patentable over Okazawa and Prager and requests the rejection's withdrawal.

**III. Allowable Subject Matter**

Claim 4 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicant hereby acknowledges and thanks the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter.

Regarding the objection, claim 4 depends upon claim 1 and, as discussed above, the rejection of claim 1 is improper. Therefore, Applicant has not rewritten claim 4 in independent form and respectfully requests the objection's withdrawal.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the above, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 08-2025, under Order No. 10001728-3 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: April 11, 2007

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is e-filed on the date shown below.

Dated: 04/11/2007

Signature: 

Joy H. Perigo

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Michael A. Papalas  
Registration No.: 40,381  
(214) 855-8186  
(214) 855-8200 (Fax)  
Attorney for Applicant